

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
GAELLE MORISSEAU,

Plaintiff,

-v-

GLOBAL A BRANDS, INC. AND TIM ALFORD, AN
INDIVIDUAL,

Defendants.
-----X

23-CV-05679 (JAV) (SDA)

ORDER ADOPTING
REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION

JEANNETTE A. VARGAS, United States District Judge:

This default judgment motion was referred to Magistrate Judge Stewart D. Aaron for an inquest on damages. *See* Docket No. 95. In the Report and Recommendation filed on July 3, 2025, Magistrate Judge Aaron recommended that the Court enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff against Defendants, jointly and severally, in the amount of \$59,136.96 (consisting of \$12,358.00 in unpaid wages; \$1,785.16 in unused accrued vacation time; \$3,501.32 in unpaid overtime; \$10,000.00 for failure to provide notices and wage statements; and \$31,492.48 in liquidated damages). ECF No. 108. The Magistrate Judge further recommended that Plaintiff be awarded \$43,397.50 in attorneys’ fees and \$1,086.58 in costs, as well as post-judgment interest. *Id.*

In reviewing a Report and Recommendation, a district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A district court “must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *see also United States v. Male Juvenile*, 121 F.3d 34, 38 (2d Cir. 1997). Conclusory or general objections that merely refer the district court to previously filed papers or arguments do not constitute proper objections under Rule 72(b). *Miller v. Brightstar Asia, Ltd.*, 43 F.4th 112, 120 (2d Cir. 2022).

To accept those portions of the report to which no timely or proper objection has been made, a district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record. *See id.* at 120 & n.4.


In the present case, the Report and Recommendation advised the parties that they had fourteen days from service of the Report and Recommendation to file any objections, and warned that failure to timely file such objections would result in waiver of any right to object. *See* ECF No. 108. In addition, the Report and Recommendation expressly called Defendants' attention to Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Nevertheless, as of the date of this Order, no objections have been filed and no request for an extension of time to object has been made. Accordingly, Defendants have waived the right to object to the Report and Recommendation or to obtain appellate review. *See Miller*, 43 F.4th at 120.

Despite the waiver, the Court has reviewed the petition and the Report and Recommendation, unguided by objections, and finds the Report and Recommendation to be well reasoned and grounded in fact and law. The Court agrees entirely with the thorough and detailed analysis, including with respect to attorney's fees. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is ADOPTED in its entirety.

The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment in accordance with the recommendations in the Report and Recommendation, and to terminate all pending motions.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 28, 2025
New York, New York


JEANNETTE A. VARGAS
United States District Judge